



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

better opportunity than the employee to know the conditions of that tool, and the rule in the principal case is just in all cases of latent defects, where the employee's lack of knowledge is not due to negligence.

NEGLIGENCE—RULE OF RES IPSA LOQUITUR.—Defendant company's street car collided with a train at a crossing. Plaintiff, a passenger on the street car, charged negligence generally. *Held*, that the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* applied, and the burden was on the defendant to show there was no negligence. *Nagel v. United Rys. Co. of St. Louis* (Mo. 1913), 152 S. W. 621.

It is the general rule, in cases of collisions of cars, where negligence is charged generally, that the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* applies. *Elgin A. & S. Trac. Co. v. Wilson*, 217 Ill. 47, 4 St. Ry. Rep. 193, 75 N. E. 436; *North Baltimore Pass. R. Co. v. Kaskell*, 78 Md. 517, 28 Atl. 510; *Magrane v. St. L. & S. Ry. Co.*, 183 Mo. 119, 3 St. Ry. Rep. 563, 81 S. W. 1158; *Kay v. Metrop. St. R. Co.*, 163 N. Y. 447, 29 App. Div. (N. Y.) 466, 51 N. Y. Supp. 724; *Abel v. Northampton T. Co.*, 212 Pa. St. 329, 4 St. Ry. Rep. 960, 61 Atl. 915. Where the collision is between cars belonging to and under the control of different companies, the doctrine applies to the company on whose car the plaintiff was a passenger, but not to the other company. *Loudoun v. Eighth Av. R. Co.*, 162 N. Y. 380, 56 N. E. 988.

SALES—INCIDENCE OF RISK AS BEARING ON PASSAGE OF TITLE.—Plaintiff agreed to put up 10,000 lbs. of yolks of eggs, place the same in cold storage as prepared, and ship f. o. b. to defendant as needed. Plaintiff was to pay storage and insurance till January 1. By the preceding October the entire amount had been prepared and stored with the designated cold storage company, but spoiled before January 1. In an action for the price, the defendant buyer claimed that since the risk of loss of the goods was on the seller till January, title remained in the seller also, with the accompanying risk of the eggs' spoiling. *Held*, that title passed to the buyer in October when the entire amount of yolks had been placed in storage, and that the stipulation throwing the risk on the seller after that time was an indication that title then passed. *Stewart v. Henningsen Produce Co.* (Kans. 1913), 129 Pac. 181.

Ordinarily the rule is that, "*Res perit domino*," the title and risk going together. BENJAMIN, SALES, 5th Ed., 402; WILLISTON, SALES, § 301; SALES ACT, § 22. But the risk may be separated from the title by agreement. WILLISTON, SALES, § 302; *Illinois Glass Co. v. U. S. Horse Radish Co.*, 166 Mich. 520. When the passing of title to goods is in dispute, a stipulation in the contract concerned that the risk is on the one party or the other raises two conflicting inferences, sometimes in the same court. See the opinions of BLACKBURN and COCKBURN in *Martineau v. Kitching*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 436. According to the *Elgee Cotton Cases*, 22 Wall. 180, the fact that the risk is expressly assumed by the one party indicates that the title is in the other. "The stipulation that the cotton should be at the risk of the buyer, instead of showing an intention of the parties that the right of property should pass to him seems rather to indicate a purpose that the ownership should remain unchanged. Else why introduce a provision wholly unnecessary?" In other